

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 10 and 17 have been amended. Claims 5 and 24 have been cancelled. Claims 25 and 26 were previously cancelled. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-4 and 6-23 are currently pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

In regard to the Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 20, 21 and 24 under 35 USC § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 20, 21 and 24 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Geyer. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been overcome by the present amendment.

The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to the following elements of claim 1:

a plurality of teeth disposed about the first outer surface;

a first ring attached to the flywheel about the second outer surface;

The above elements of claim 1 are not taught by Geyer. The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to Figure 2 of Geyer, which shows that the teeth 16 of Geyer are disposed about a resilient rubber annulus 20, and no other ring is disposed about the flywheel. In addition, Figure 3 of Geyer shows that the teeth 15' are disposed about a metal ring 30, not a different outer diameter of the flywheel. As such, Geyer does not teach teeth and a first ring respectively attached to different outer surfaces of a flywheel.

Therefore, at least one element of claim 1 is not taught by Geyer, and the Examiner is requested to withdraw his rejection of claim 1 and claims 2-3 and 6-8 depending therefrom.

The Examiner's attention is additionally directed to the following elements of claim 10:

a plurality of teeth disposed about the first outer surface;
and

an elastomer ring having a first side attached to the second outer surface of the flywheel

The above elements of claim 10 are not taught by Geyer. In Geyer, the teeth are disposed about a resilient rubber annulus 20. Geyer does not teach teeth and an elastomer ring respectively attached to different outer surfaces of a flywheel.

Therefore, at least one element of claim 10 is not taught by Geyer, and the Examiner is requested to withdraw his rejection of claim 10 and claims 11, 14 and 15 depending therefrom.

The Examiner's attention is additionally directed to the following elements of claim 17:

a ring gear disposed about the first outer surface; and

a flexible membrane disposed between the inner diameter of the ring and the second outer surface of the flywheel

The above elements of claim 17 are not taught by Geyer. As argued above with respect to claim 10, Geyer does not teach a ring gear and a flexible membrane respectively attached to different outer surfaces of a flywheel.

Therefore, at least one element of claim 17 is not taught by Geyer, and the Examiner is requested to withdraw his rejection of claim 17 and claims 20 and 21 depending therefrom.

In regard to the Rejection of Claims 1, 5-8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 19, 20, 21 and 24 under 35 USC § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 5-8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 19, 20, 21 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Henrich. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been overcome by the present amendment.

The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to the following element of claim 1:

a plurality of teeth disposed about the first outer surface;

The above element of claim 1 is not taught by Henrich. The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to Figure 2 of Henrich, from which it will appear that the flywheel taught by Henrich has no teeth, and Henrich nowhere teaches or suggests a flywheel with teeth. As such, Henrich does not teach a plurality of teeth disposed about a first outer surface.

MONTREAL:SES36.1

Therefore, at least one element of claim 1 is not taught by Henrich, and the Examiner is requested to withdraw his rejection of claim 1 and claims 6-8 depending therefrom.

The Examiner's attention is additionally directed to the following element of claim 10:

a plurality of teeth disposed about the first outer surface;

The above element of claim 10 is not taught by Henrich. As argued above in respect of claim 1, Henrich does not teach a plurality of teeth disposed about a first outer diameter.

Therefore, at least one element of claim 10 is not taught by Henrich, and the Examiner is requested to withdraw his rejection of claim 10 and claims 12 and 14 depending therefrom.

The Examiner's attention is additionally directed to the following element of claim 17:

a ring gear disposed about the first outer surface;

The above element of claim 17 is not taught by Henrich. The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to Figure 2 of Henrich, from which it will appear that the flywheel taught by Henrich has no ring gear, and Henrich nowhere teaches or suggests a ring gear. As such, Henrich does not teach the above element of claim 17.

Therefore, at least one element of claim 17 is not taught by Henrich, and the Examiner is requested to withdraw his rejection of claim 17 and claims 19, 20 and 21 depending therefrom.

In regard to the Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13, 14, 16-18 and 20-24 under 35 USC § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13, 14, 16-18 and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP8-42637. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been overcome by the present amendment.

The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to the following elements of claim 1:

a plurality of teeth disposed about the first outer surface;

a first ring attached to the flywheel about the second outer surface;

The above elements of claim 1 are not taught by JP8-42637. The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to Figure 2 of JP8-42637, from which it will appear that the flywheel 12 taught by JP8-42637 does not have first and second outer surfaces defined by first and second outer diameters. By extension, JP8-42637 nowhere teaches or suggests a first ring attached to a flywheel about a second outer surface defined by a second outer diameter.

Therefore, at least one element of claim 1 is not taught by JP8-42637, and the Examiner is requested to withdraw his rejection of claim 1 and claims 2 and 6-9 depending therefrom.

The Examiner's attention is additionally directed to the following elements of claim 10:

a plurality of teeth disposed about the first outer surface;
and

an elastomer ring having a first side attached to the second outer surface of the flywheel

The above elements of claim 10 are not taught by JP8-42637. As argued above with respect to claim 1, JP8-42637 does not teach first and second outer surfaces defined by first and second outer diameters, or by extension anything disposed thereabout or attached thereto.

Therefore, at least one element of claim 10 is not taught by JP8-42637, and the Examiner is requested to withdraw his rejection of claim 10 and claims 13, 14 and 16 depending therefrom.

The Examiner's attention is additionally directed to the following elements of claim 17:

a ring gear disposed about the first outer surface; and

a flexible membrane disposed between the inner diameter of the ring and the second outer surface of the flywheel

The above element of claim 17 is not taught by JP8-42637. As argued above in respect of claim 1, JP8-42637 does not teach first and second outer surfaces defined by first and second outer diameters, or by extension anything disposed thereabout or therebetween.

Serial No.: 10/605,937

Art Unit: 3747

Examiner: KAMEN, Noah P.

Page 10 of 10

Therefore, at least one element of claim 17 is not taught by JP8-42637, and the Examiner is requested to withdraw his rejection of claim 17 and claims 18 and 20-23 depending therefrom.

In view of the above remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that all of the currently pending claims are allowable and that the entire application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable to place the application in a better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan D. Cutler, Reg. No. 40,576
OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT LLP
Attorneys for the Applicant

January 27, 2006

OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT LLP
1000 de la Gauchetière St. West
Suite 2100
Montréal, Québec H3B 4W5
Canada

Tel. (514) 904-5624
Fax. (514) 904-8101